REMARKS:

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated August 4, 2009. Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of parent Claim 1 under 35 USC 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner takes the position that the phrase "solution viscosity", which is recited in Claim 1, is not adequately described in the Specification. The Examiner further states that the phrase "solution viscosity" is used "only when referring to a property having no units (which is referred to in the pertinent art as 'solution viscosity' or 'relative solution viscosity')". The Examiner concludes that "Since Applicant's usage of terminology ("solution viscosity") and units (ml/g) appears to be inconsistent with the accepted conventions in the art..." clarification is required.

Reconsideration of the above position is respectfully requested. There is, in fact, a difference between "solution viscosity" and "relative solution viscosity". The solution viscosity gives a value for the viscosity of a polymer in a solvent which is expressed in ml/g. The relative solution viscosity is calculated by subtracting 1 from the value of the solution viscosity and dividing the result by the concentration of the solution. Therefore, the relative solution viscosity has no unit. To support this statement, the European Standard EN ISO 307 is enclosed. In this Standard in item 3 the solution viscosity (viscosity number VN) and the relative solution viscosity are defined. It is noted that page 2, lines 24-26 of the Specification does not refer to "relative solution viscosity", and when referring to "solution viscosity" also refers to this European Standard "ISO 307".

Reconsideration is also requested of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. In that regard, the Examiner indicated that it is not clear as to which material the "solution viscosity" is intended to be referred to in Claim 1. In order to remove any doubts, Claim 1 has now been amended to refer to "the solution viscosity of the polyamide mixture". Support for this claim language is found, for example, at page 2, lines 22-26 of the Specification wherein mention is made of the mixtures composed of polyamides and then it is stated that it is

preferable to use "polyamides through solution viscosity is less than 140 ml/g". As clearly stated, the free-flowing polyamides, which are described at lines 24-26 relate to the polyamides for the production of the casing and therefore to the mixture and not to the individual polyamides which form the mixture.

With regard to the further rejection of Claim 1 as being indefinite because the exact property of "solution viscosity" cannot be ascertained and that the prior art uses such phrase only when referring to a property having no units, the Examiner is referred to the discussion above pointing out that the phrase "solution viscosity" is properly used with units.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of Claims 1-4 and 6 as unpatentable over Campbell U.S. 6,228,912 in view of Christ U.S. 5,567,797.

U.S. 6,228,912 discloses the casing for an electronic device which is suitable for the use as a monitor housing. The casing comprises a heat-resistant, flame-retardant thermoplastic, wherein the thermoplastic material may have a polyamide-based structure. However, '912 does not disclose that a mixture of at least two polyamides with different solution viscosity is used. Further, it is not disclosed that the solution viscosity of the polyamide used is less than 140 ml/g, measured to ISO 307 in a sulfuric acid solution comprising: 0.005 g/ml of specimen.

U.S. 5,567,797 discloses a mixture of polyamide 6 and polyamide 6,6 wherein the relative solution viscosity in sulfuric acid is 1.79 or 1.78, respectively. However, a relative solution viscosity of 1.79 or 1.78, respectively, as disclosed in '797 corresponds to a solution viscosity of 158 ml/g if the concentration is 0.005 g/ml as disclosed in the examples of '797. The solution viscosity therefore is greater than 140ml/g and not less than 140 ml/g as claimed in Claim 1.

Since neither U.S. '912 nor U.S. '797 disclose a solution viscosity of the mixture of polyamides which is less than 140 ml/g, the features of present Claim 1 are novel.

It is clear that Claim 1 is also not obvious from the prior art. U.S. 6,228,912 discloses that an improvement in melt flow can be achieved when one molecular weight grade of at least

one resinous constituent. However, it is not disclosed that a mixture of at least two polyamides with different solution viscosity is used. Further, there is no hint given in '912 that the solution viscosity is less than 140 ml/g measured to ISO 307 in a sulfuric acid solution comprising 0.005 g/ml of specimen.

Since it is only disclosed in '912 that at least one resinous constituent having a first molecular weight grade is combined with a similar resinous constituent having a lower molecular weight grade to achieve an improvement in melt flow but there is no hint given in which way the components shall be mixed, it is not obvious to a skilled person, that satisfying properties of the polymer will be achieved when the solution viscosity of the polymer is less than 140 ml/g, measured to ISO 307 in sulfuric acid solution comprising 0.005 g/ml of specimen.

Since the solution viscosity of the polyamide is disclosed in U.S. 5,567,797 is bigger than the solution viscosity as claimed in Claim 1, the skilled person does not achieve the subject matter of present Claim 1 by U.S. '912 in view of U.S. '797. Therefore, the subject matter of present Claim 1 is based on an inventive step.

Nishihara, U.S. 6,790,887 was added to the combination of U.S. 6,228,912 and U.S. 5,567,797 in the rejection of dependent Claim 5. U.S. 6,790,887, however, does not overcome the deficiencies of the '912 and '797 patents which were used in the rejection of parent Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 5 should also be allowable because of the features added to that claim as well as its dependency on Claim 4, which in turn is dependent on Claim 1.

For the reasons submitted above it is respectfully requested that this application should be passed to issue. If the Examiner still considers the claims to be unpatentable over, for example, the prior art, then it is requested that this amendment be entered for purposes of appeal since it would reduce the issues on appeal by obviating the Section 112 rejections.

Dated: November 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Harold Pezzner
Registration No.: 22,112
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
Correspondence Customer Number: 23416
Attorney for Applicant

729945